Wisconsin Department of Administration
Division of Executive Budget and Finance
DOA-2048 (R07/2000)

Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected ☐ Supplemental

LRB Number **01-2068/1**	Introduction Number **SB-255**

Subject

Counting 4-year-old kindergarten pupils

Fiscal Effect

State:

☐ No State Fiscal Effect
☐ Indeterminate
- ☒ Increase Existing Appropriations
- ☐ Decrease Existing Appropriations
- ☐ Create New Appropriations
- ☐ Increase Existing Revenues
- ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues
- ☐ Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget ☐ Yes ☐ No
- ☐ Decrease Costs

Local:

☐ No Local Government Costs
☐ Indeterminate
1. ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
2. ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
3. ☒ Increase Revenue ☒ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
4. ☐ Decrease Revenue ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory

5. Types of Local Government Units Affected
☐ Towns ☐ Village ☐ Cities
☐ Counties ☐ Others
☒ School Districts ☐ WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected **Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations**

☒ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEGS 20.255 (2) (ac)

Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date
DPI/ Keith Pollock (608) 266-1344	Faye Stark (608) 266-1966	10/1/01

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DPI 10/1/01

LRB Number **01-2068/1**	Introduction Number **SB-255**	Estimate Type **Original**
Subject		
Counting 4-year-old kindergarten pupils		

Assumptions Used In Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under current law, a four-year-old kindergarten (4K) pupil enrolled in a program offering 437 hours of instruction is counted as 0.5 member regardless of the hours of instruction offered, unless the program provides at least 87.5 additional hours of outreach activities in which the pupil is counted as 0.6 member.

Beginning in 2002-03, this bill provides that four-year-old kindergarten pupils would be counted for school aid and revenue limit purposes on a full-time equivalency basis (FTE), reflective of the number of hours scheduled for the program. Furthermore, this bill eliminates the current law provision that allows a pupil to be counted an additional 0.1 member because a program provides 87.5 hours of additional outreach activities.

This estimate assumes the following: 1) The number of 4K pupils participating would not increase from the 2000-01 membership count; 2) Currently, school districts only provide 4K programs offering 437 hours of instruction and certain programs provide 87.5 hours of outreach activities. In other words, 4K pupils are counted only as .5 member or .6 member for state aid or revenue limit purposes (state law provides that the department pay no additional state aid to a district that provides overs 524.5 hours (instructional and outreach) annually, therefore 4K membership is not collected on an actual prorated FTE basis) ; 3) school districts currently operating 4K programs would increase their programs to full-day only; and 4) It is assumed 50% of the number of pupils who currently participate in partial day 4K programs would enter into full-day 4K programs in 2002-03.

Counting 4-year-old kindergarten pupils on an FTE basis would increase statewide membership by roughly 3,140 members for revenue limit purposes. Subsequently, partial school revenues would increase by approximately $3.9 million in 2002-03.

State Fiscal Effect
The assumptions above would provide that general school aids would be increased by roughly $2.6 million (2/3 x $3.9 million) in order to maintain the state's two-thirds funding commitment.

Local Fiscal Effect
The assumptions above would provide that school districts would increase their school property tax levies by $1.3 million (1/3 x $3.9 million).

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

The full effect of this provision would be phased in as membership for revenue limit purposes is based on a three-year average. Therefore, in 2003-04, partial school revenues due to the increased 4K membership provided by this bill would double and triple in 2004-05, as all 3,140 4K pupils would be counted for revenue limit purposes. State and local costs would also double in 2003-04 and triple in 2004-05. Furthermore, it is likely that this bill could encourage additional 4K programs and pupils and, thus more additional state and local costs.

Committee Meeting Attendance Sheet

Senate Committee on Education

Date: 10-9-01 Meeting Type: Jauch / Baumgart

Location: SB 255

Committee Member	~~Present~~ Aye	~~Absent~~ No	Excused
Sen. Richard Grobschmidt, Chair	✓		
Sen. Robert Jauch	✓		
Sen. Kevin Shibilski			
Sen. Jim Baumgart	✓		
Sen. Judith Robson	✓		
Sen. Jon Erpenbach			
Sen. Carol Roessler		✓	
Sen. Alberta Darling – by polling –		✓	
Sen. Mary Lazich		✓	
Sen. Sheila Harsdorf		✓	
Sen. Ted Kanavas		✓	
Totals:	_____	_____	_____

Lisa Moen, Committee Clerk

Testimony on SB 255 Presented to the Committee on Education of the Wisconsin Senate

By Larry Kaseman, Executive Director of the Wisconsin Parents Association

October 9, 2001

Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee:

Some of you know me as a strong advocate of homeschooling. Let me say that as homeschoolers, we oppose SB 255 as a step toward mandatory four-year-old kindergarten and a lowering of the compulsory school attendance age.

But I am here today with a much larger concern. I am here to speak on behalf of four year olds in Wisconsin, not just those whose parents plan to homeschool them. I am here to apply what I have learned about education and the institutionalization of young children to the question of whether the state of Wisconsin should fund full-day four-year-old kindergartens.

I am strongly convinced that programs for such young children should not be funded. Such programs are not in the best interest of children who would be enrolled in them and are not in the best interest of the citizens of Wisconsin.

Evidence is lacking that would support the idea that attending full-day kindergarten is good for four year olds. In addition, there is evidence that indicates that attending such programs would be harmful to them.

First, let's consider evidence that is often cited to justify four-year-old kindergartens. The most frequently mentioned studies are those done on the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan, beginning in the 1960's. These studies concluded that when four year olds participated in preschool programs, they were more likely to do better academically in five-year-old kindergarten and first grade. However, two major factors in these studies render them useless as a support for state funding for four-year-old kindergarten for all children. First, the studies focused on children from severely disadvantaged homes limited by poverty and other social factors. The studies' conclusions cannot be applied to the vast majority of children who do not come from such a limited home environment. Second, even for children from seriously disadvantaged homes, the benefits of four-year-old programs had disappeared by the time they reached second or third grade, at which time they were experiencing the same academic problems as children from a similar environment who had not attended special programs when they were four. Therefore, the Ypsilanti studies and others that focus on a select group of children cannot be used to support a plan for four-year-old kindergartens for all children. In fact, evidence is lacking that would provide solid support for such programs.

On the contrary, many experts have argued that instead of pressuring children to do academic work at earlier ages, we should allow them more time to grow and mature physically, neurologically, and emotionally before trying to teach them academic subjects. A recent example of this perspective can be found in attachment 1, "Tot Thought." The author, Jerome Bruner, points out on page 6 that, "Hungarian schoolchildren do not start reading and writing until they are seven; yet they end up near the top of the European league by age twelve." On page 9, Bruner comments, "Much of the worry about 'deprivation' is misplaced; and so is the counterpart worry that we aren't 'stimulating' children enough. Most kids have plenty of stimulation, and there is no credible evidence that higher-pressure, more 'enriched' early environments produce 'good' effects in the sense that drastically deprived ones produce bad effects. Certainly the European evidence I cited earlier should give us pause about 'kid-pushing' in general. Perhaps Hungary has a lesson to teach us."

Second, let's consider evidence that indicates how four-year-old kindergarten programs would affect children who attended them. Since such kindergartens are a relatively new idea, studies that show the effects of sending four year olds to school have not yet been done. However, it is very instructive to look at studies of the effects of institutionalizing younger children.

For example, a recently released study of more than 1,300 children ages 0 to 3 links time children spend in child care and aggressive behavior. According to a report on the study, "The more hours that toddlers spend in child care, the more likely the are to turn out aggressive, disobedient and defiant by the time they are in kindergarten, according to the largest and most authoritative study of child care and development ever conducted." (See attachment 2, "Child care linked to aggressive behavior. Study finds toddlers' time in facilities boosts likelihood of defiance." *Detroit News*, April 19, 2001, p. 3 ff.)

The prevalence and seriousness of aggressive behavior in children is documented by attachment 3, "Bullying affects nearly one in three kids" (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, April 25, 2001) The story begins, "Amid growing concern over school violence, a nationwide study has found that bullying involved nearly one of every three U. S. children in sixth through 10th grades. Young students and boys were most likely to be involved."

The negative effects that current kindergarten programs have on children are documented in attachment 4, "Early Childhood: Unacceptable Trends in Kindergarten Entry and Placement," an Overview of Position Statement by the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. In response to increasing demands being made of kindergartners, in part because of increasing use of standardized tests, many schools are denying entrance into kindergarten to some children, developing segregated transitional classes for children deemed unready for the next level of school, and requiring more students to repeat kindergarten. Attachment 4 expresses the concerns of early childhood specialists about the negative effects of such well-intentioned practices that "1) assign the burden of responsibility to the child, rather than the program; 2) place the child at risk of failure, apathy toward school, and demoralization; and 3) fail to contribute to quality of early childhood education."

I ask you, when we are having so much difficulty managing five-year-old kindergarten programs that have been in place for many years, how can this be a good time to add new programs for even younger children?

Among the many practical concerns about four-year-old kindergarten is making sure that children who have to get up early to spend a full day in school get enough sleep. Attachment 5, "Adding Some Sleep to Children's Agenda," discusses the importance of sleep to children and the problems that sleep deprivation can cause.

It is sometimes claimed that kindergarten should be available for four year olds because parents want it. However, as attachment 6 shows, studies indicate that parents would rather be home with their young children than have them in daycare or preschool.

In sum, these studies show that when children are not institutionalized in daycare or preschool programs do much better and are not as antisocial or troubled.

In light of both the lack of evidence that children who are not from severely disadvantaged homes would benefit from attending full-day four-year old kindergarten and of evidence that institutionalizing young children has negative effects, I strongly urge the committee to vote against SB 255.

Thank you for your consideration of this serious matter. I would be happy to answer questions.

Attachment 1

March 9, 2000

The New York Review of Books

Tot Thought
JEROME BRUNER

The Scientist in the Crib: Minds, Brains, and How Children Learn
by Alison Gopnik, Andrew N. Meltzoff, and Patricia K. Kuhl
279 pages, $24.00 (hardcover)
published by Morrow

The Myth of the First Three Years: A New Understanding of Early Brain Development and Lifelong Learning
by John T. Bruer
244 pages, $25.00 (hardcover)
published by Free Press

[Part] 1

Why are adults half-blind to the ways of the child's mind? Equally puzzling, why are they so gullible about fashionable dogmas on that oddly vexed subject? Years ago I was stunned to hear Anna Freud declare in a lecture at Harvard that if a three-year-old wandered unrestrained from Central Square to Harvard Square, he would likely commit every crime in the statute books on the way. How had psychoanalysis managed to displace Rousseau's Emile or William Blake's "Songs of Innocence" from mythological center stage so quickly?

The usual explanation for adult incomprehension of the child's mind is, of course, that we are all victims of infantile amnesia and, having forgotten what our own early childhood was like, we must learn about it again from scratch and from the outside. Yet there is something a bit fishy about this standard account. For, in fact, we are the only species where parents really teach their young—and we are astonishingly adept at it. It is remarkable, for example, how human adults talking with young children simplify their syntax and lexicon to match what the kid can understand.1 And we talk cute "Motherese" without instruction, and without even realizing how crucial it is for modeling the prosody and sound structures of a language. So, though we may be half-blind about the child's mind, we obviously know far more about it than we realize, know it (as some seem to draw comfort from saying) unconsciously.

But what about our gullibility in accepting fashionable dogmas, particularly gloomy ones? Are we so anxious about our parental duties that we attend only to those things kids do that tell us whether we're succeeding or failing as parents? Does that blind us to the ordinary day-to-dayness of how young children's minds work? We seem even less curious about the "mental processes" of young kids than we are about our own.

An example. There's no other species on the face of the earth whose young point to things to bring them to the attention of an adult, even looking back from the things pointed out to see whether the adult "got it." Not even our closest primate cousins do it. Even blind human babies do it in response to strange sounds, also at about eight months, though their pointing usually disappears a month or two after it starts, unrequited by feedback from adults. It is an evolutionary miracle. But parents, generally, just take it for granted, pay it no heed—unless it fails to appear, as in autistic babies.

[foot note]——1 See the chapter by Catherine Snow in C.E. Snow and C.A. Ferguson, editors, *Talking to Children* (Cambridge University Press, 1977).

[Part] 2

Then gullibility sets in. Despite having witnessed this wizard act of "intersubjective" sharing

right there at cribside, parents (educated ones especially) are fully prepared to buy a wildly exaggerated dogma of "egocentrism": that young children in their first few years are incapable of recognizing or appreciating another human being's perspective. Even psychologists went overboard on this one. And it has taken the last two decades of research to shake a belief that should have been seen as absurd from the start by any observer. The fact is that virtually from birth, we are involved, we human beings, in refining and perfecting our species-unique gift of sharing attention and achieving workable "intersubjectivity."2

But once again the anomaly of "not knowing what you know" interferes with our recognizing the reality. In fact, if you do a close frame-by-frame analysis of mothers and infants during their first eight months, say, it is plain as day that the mothers know exquisitely well how to manage direct eye-to-eye contact, how to respond to their infant's efforts to bring objects into those eye-to-eye bouts, or just what kind of expression to use to tempt their baby to follow a shift in the direction of their gaze. We might say they know unconsciously. Or perhaps we should say something like "Humans are born parents!" Born that way or not, parents seem to know a very great deal more than they know that they know—including here as well older siblings and baby sitters, among many others.

Perhaps it's the social definition of "growing up" and "bringing up" that produces our half-blindness and our gullibility. For, as Philippe Ariès3 long ago made plain, raising children, however much it expresses human tenderness, is also an ideological, social, and religious enterprise, fraught with duties and moral responsibilities. And like all such enterprises, it is hemmed in by dangers and pitfalls that all too easily create attitudes that suppress what, from a broader perspective, seems like "just" common sense. Can we discern in the dogma of all-encompassing childhood egocentrism—which runs so counter to the day-to-day, observable relations of ordinary parents with their children—the long arm of Christian dogmas of selfishness and original sin? It is not that children come out of Blake's "Songs of Innocence," but only that they are complicated and far more familiar with the world than is often acknowledged—"the adult in the crib," to paraphrase the title of one of the books under review.

In recent times, of course, things have become even more complex. Hillary Rodham Clinton may indeed be right that "it takes a village" to raise a child. But the village would be in tough shape without federal and state funds. And can you let one in ten American children grow up in families below the poverty line, no matter in what village—given that those poor kids will mostly be living in the village's black ghetto? What kind of theory of the child's mind and its development is most usefully brought to bear on problems of this kind?

[foot note]——2 Chris Moore and Philip Dunham, editors, *Joint Attention: Its Origins Role in Development* (Erlbaum, 1995).

[foot note]——3 Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (Knopf, 1962).

[Part] 3

Which brings us to the two books under review. *The Scientist in the Crib*, by Alison Gopnik, Andrew Meltzoff, and Patricia Kuhl, is a triumph, a clear-headed account of the kinds of things that go on inside the heads of young children. It describes the way young kids look at the world, how they go about coping with the endless problems they encounter, and how parents, as it were, manage "as if born to it" to help them understand what it's all about. But more important than anything else, it sets out a way of looking at the mind growing up that forswears baby-book norms, current jeremiads about "teach-them-early-or-lose-out- forever," and dogmas about "the" right way to bring up kids. And most refreshingly, its authors could not care less about the labels of the disciplines they draw on—psychology, neuroscience, linguistics. They are experts in the new "cognitive sciences" but with none of the cocksure "cog sci" baby-as-computer-to-be-programmed attitudes of a decade ago; they wear their learning lightly and gracefully.

The other book, John Bruer's *The Myth of the First Three Years*, is of a different genre altogether. It is an expression of protest, levelheaded though it may be, speaking out strongly

against the all too prevalent false claim that if young children don't embark on a serious learning career by the third year, they will fall irreversibly behind and even suffer brain defects. It is a troubled and troubling book.

How could the dogmas attacked in Bruer's book have gained credence in a world that gave birth to *The Scientist in the Crib*—the pair published within weeks of each other? Why are even such well-intentioned proponents of adequate child care as Hillary Rodham Clinton hinting that contemporary brain research demonstrates that (to use the current mantra) "early is forever"?

The Scientist in the Crib speaks in the voice of intelligent parents talking to other intelligent parents—witty, rather personal, and very well informed. The three authors report "data"; they review and reframe great philosophical dilemmas; but their good-humored admission of their own, shall I say, epistemic vulnerability keeps their story buoyant throughout. The book will be as well received on Merton Street, where Oxford philosophers keep their debating headquarters, as it will among parents.

The authors, though caught up in the never-ending cognitive revolution of our times, begin by revisiting the "ancient questions" our forebears raised about the nature of the mind—how we gain our knowledge of the world, of others, of ourselves, and how we manage to make our knowledge known to others. From the start, they forswear the arrogance of objectivity, of the "view from nowhere": "Trying to understand human nature," they write, "is part of human nature." The best we can do is construct representations of what the world is like and test those representations against what we experience—whether we are developmental scientists or two-year-olds. And it is in that spirit that the book bears the title The Scientist in the Crib.

[Part] 4

Reversing the order characteristic of books about the mind, which usually start with how the mind knows the physical world, they take up the question of how children learn about other minds—what they seem to have by way of a beginning endowment, how they manage, with the aid of cooperating parents, to become workaday "folk psychologists." This is the new terrain of "intersubjectivity" that I mentioned earlier, and they discuss it with the flair of direct involvement. The chapter provides the opportunity for them to set out their major theme. Babies begin life with "start-up" knowledge inherited from our evolutionary past, knowledge that provides the means for making a first shot at representing what they encounter. Once they have done this, infants are in a position to repair their first "edition" in the light of new experience, which, in turn, alters previous knowledge in such a way as to make new experience possible. In short, new experience leads to new knowledge which then permits new experience, the cycle never ending. But most important, the cycle requires the involvement, even the collusion, of others, whose minds and ways of thought we come to take for granted, much as we take the world for granted. Both are constructions, representations of the physical and the social.

The authors then show how children construct a world of space, time, and causality, and they deal particularly with the human push to explain experience, showing that this involves trade-offs in which some things are represented at the expense of ignoring others and that there are forms of blindness to the world that are part of the process of learning. They turn to an engaging and wonderfully informative chapter on the ways children learn language—how and when to use it in what ways, and how to use it in representing the world of things and people. This analysis is blessedly free both of the kind of Chomskian nativism that has everything there at the start and of the equally tiresome dogmatism that treats language as a kit of social conventions.

We are given a brief but convincing account of how children master the Sound Code—how meaningless sounds are put together to make meaningful words—and an excellent description of how Motherese manages to help the child grasp the phonology, syntax, and lexicon of her mother tongue, with some shrewd added remarks on dyslexia and dysphasia. The young child's mastery of language could not proceed without the steady dialogic support from parents; nor could it ever get going without some "start-up" knowledge of how language is structured and to what uses it can be put. For the rest, as with the very development of the nervous system, the child's increasing control and understanding of language is a function of opportunities provided (or

created).

Two closing chapters tie the book together, one on what has been learned about the child's growing mind, the other about the growing brain. The growth of mind is likened to the repair of Ulysses' boat during his ten years of wandering, with Ulysses always aboard and usually under sail. "By the end of the journey hardly anything remained of the original vessel." As we go through life, new "experience interacts with what we already know about the world to produce new knowledge," and this in turn permits us to have still more new experience, which in turn transforms our knowledge. But kids have an advantage Ulysses never had: "adult teachers" usually have some useful knowledge to impart about repairing boats and other matters.

[Part] 5

The growing brain is not easily summed up, and *The Scientist in the Crib* is respectful of its complexities. The brain has 100 billion cells, each seemingly out to make a synaptic connection with any nearby cell that fires when it does (hence the neuroscience slogan "cells that fire together, wire together"). Cells either become part of a network or die off, unused. There are surprisingly few time constraints about when things "have to" happen in the nervous system, and no "critical periods," as with those birds who have to hear their native song within a certain period of time or go songless forever. The restrictions in the system are mostly imposed at any point by what connections have already been laid down: if you don't have them, you can't use them. On the other hand, most human infants, unless they're raised in a closet, have enough neural connectivity and networking capacity to move along a normal course of development:

> The new scientific research doesn't say that parents should provide special "enriching" experience over and above what they experience in everyday life. It does suggest, though, that a radically deprived environment could cause damage.

A few examples from the book may illustrate some of its major points. Take for a start the seemingly head-in-the-clouds question "What does it take to make a human being human?" First, you need to treat human beings as if they had human minds, but that comes easy—at least to our species. Parents tell you that one of their earliest parental pleasures is "discovering" that their baby has a mind. And with this starts the eye-to-eye contact and joint attention that distinguishes us from all other primates.

So parents treat kids as if they had human intentions, desires, and beliefs, and expect their babies to treat them in just that same way. And in response, kids become increasingly sensitive to mental states in others over the first year. By about eighteen months they even begin imitating intended rather than observed behavior: they imitate, for example, an adult's intended reach for an object, rather than an observed reach that had been blocked by an obstacle.

The same sensitivity to subjective states even occurs with young chimpanzees raised in the human way (to go beyond the book for a moment). Sue Savage-Rumbaugh and her colleagues, trying to "enculturate" the young bonobo Kanzi by bringing him up "human," now find him much more "intersubjective" than at the start. The little troop of appreciative graduate students treat him as if he had human desires, beliefs, and intentions, and expect the same in return. After several years, Kanzi has became so like human beings that he finds his chimpanzee-raised sister's intersubjective insensitivity almost beyond forbearance.4

[foot note]——4 I must report that when was taking one of those high-powered space- video tests that he's given regularly, I was sitting beside him on the bench, as baffled as he was by one particular problem; he showed palpable relief to find me frowning when he looked over to check. (back)

[Part] 6

So in some deep sense "becoming human" depends upon being with others who treat you as subjectively human. It starts early and does not stop. Without it, how could we ever do something as simple as hiding something from somebody? Consider an "experiment" of Alison Gopnik and

Andrew Meltzoff's. Two- and three-year-olds have to hide a toy from you but they themselves must still be able to see it. That's the game. There's a screen on the table in front of them that they can use if they want to. The two-year-olds have a terrible time getting their minds around the problem. They can't grasp the idea of using a screen to hide something behind it. Yet they have some interesting hypotheses, a bit like scientists before they hit on the right idea. One is to hide the toy behind their backs: If they can't see it, how can you? It turns out that three-year-old children solve the problem easily. Are younger kids more egocentric? Remember the eight-month-olds who bring things to your attention by pointing at them and then looking at you to determine whether you "get it"? So how do you get from eight months to three years? And just on the basis of everyday experience of the world? The transition, the authors suggest, involves a process by which the child tries out more hypotheses. And new hypotheses inevitably reflect what you've learned from trying out other ones in the past.

One of Patricia Kuhl's more revealing studies of children is based on tested knowledge of grownups. We've long known that all natural language is constructed of phonemes—that is, a speech sound, a critical change in which changes the meaning of the word of which it is a part, as when we shift from b to p, yielding blot and plot in English. Listening to speech, we ignore sound differences that do not affect meaning, like the difference between an aspirated p as in pin (which can blow out a match held close to the mouth) and an unaspirated p as in spin (which won't even make the flame flicker). Spin remains the same word whether you blow on the p or not.

What shifts in speech sound do ten-month-olds distinguish, even before they've mastered their mother tongue? Are they already tuned to its phonemes, like the grownups who look after them? Patricia Kuhl exposed children to a series of speech sounds a few seconds apart, say l as in lemon, look, light. Kids very soon became habituated, got bored, let their attention wander. But then she slipped a new sound into the series, one that lives on the other side of the English phoneme boundary between l and r, as in going from look to rook. A ten-month-old raised in an English-speaking environment, bored with the succession of l sounds, will snap right back to attention when an r appears. But not a Japanese ten-month-old: to him, as to his parents, l and r are the same old thing, lot and rot interchangeable, indistinguishable. So how do you master the phoneme structure of your native language before you start speaking it? That is still not fully understood. What Kuhl found is that kids babble in the phonemes of their own language before they talk it. But how do kids under ten months accomplish that? By listening to Motherese, perhaps?

[Part] 7

John Bruer is a philosopher of science and distinguished foundation executive, president of the McDonell Foundation, which dispenses millions annually in support of developmental research, brain research included. In *The Myth of the First Three Years* he describes how he became annoyed at false claims about the way the brain may be irreversibly stunted by "deprivation." He was particularly provoked in the spring of 1996 when he read reports from a workshop called "Bridging the Gap between Neuroscience and Education," sponsored by the influential Education Commission of the States and the Charles A. Dana Foundation. "What seemed to be happening," he writes, "was that selected pieces of rather old brain science were being used, and often misinterpreted, to support preexisting views about child development and early childhood policy." Then a year later, much the same thing happened at a White House conference on "Early Childhood Development and Learning: What New Research on the Brain Tells Us about Our Youngest Children."

Bruer first sets out to discredit claims about the once-and-forever effects of early stimulation on later brain development and he does this with authority. His objective, plainly, is to discourage recklessness in high places—whether in the White House or on the campaign trail—for he feels that there is a danger of stampeding parents and educators with the "scare talk." They would do better if they could simply enjoy their children: play with them, sing to them, read to them, talk with them.

Bruer begins by reviewing the "brain science" usually cited to promote the importance of early

stimulation, such as the research that won David Hubel and Torsten Wiesel their Nobel Prize in 1981. If you block off vision in one eye of a kitten for its first months of life and leave the other eye exposed to the world, the occluded eye, in effect, becomes blind, all the neurons that might have served it either having died or been taken over by other brain functions. In fact, that wasn't even a new story then: ophthalmic surgeons had long warned against delay in removing opaque cataracts. The visual system simply does not develop without light.

But the brute fact of the matter is that very little else in the nervous system is anywhere near that specialized that early. Hubel and Wiesel's findings simply cannot be generalized to apply to most other brain functions. And even early blindness with translucent cataracts that let through some light but no image has no such drastic effects.5 Another bit of evidence that is often misinterpreted is from Peter Huttenlocher's study of "synaptic density" cited by Bruer.6 The brain's synaptic connections increase rapidly in the first three years and then begin to decline. Should you try to stimulate these connections? As Bruer points out, early growth is genetically programmed and not driven by stimulation at all.

[Footnote]——5 Richard L. Gregory, *Eye and Brain: The Psychology of Seeing* (McGraw-Hill, 1966).

[Footnote]——6 For a summary of Huttenlocher and related research, see Chapter 3 of Bruer's book. Bibliographical references to this work are also provided in Bruer's notes.

[Part] 8

Even scare claims that supposedly derive from school experience and are not related to brain research are dubious—like starting reading and writing as early as you can. Hungarian schoolchildren do not start reading and writing until they are seven; yet they end up near the top of the European league by age twelve. Is there such a thing, neuronally or otherwise, as the appropriate time to start learning the three Rs? Not a shred of evidence confirms that one period is critical and not another. Bruer writes: "There is no research on how different kinds of day care or preschool affect a child's brain."

After examining a host of early child care programs, an $88 million study carried out by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (and made much of at the 1997 White House conference) found that they had only minor effects. Psychologically well-adjusted mothers and sensitive, responsive mothers had the most securely attached infants, the study concluded. But the "amount, stability, type, or quality" of child care beyond what a mother provided had little effect on a child's attachment to her mother. It seems neither to enhance it nor, for that matter, to interfere with it. The only exception is for children raised in economically disadvantaged families where high-quality child care compensates somewhat for poor mothering.

As for child care's effect on cognitive development, the chief finding was that kids looked after "by adults who engage with them in frequent affectionate responsive interactions" during the first three years of life develop better cognitive and linguistic skills. This is true whether such care comes from the parent or from child care helpers—but parent care has a much greater effect. Indeed, present high-quality day care (holding quality of parental care constant) has a disappointingly small, though statistically significant, beneficial effect, "accounting for between 1 and 4 percent of the difference between children's scores on tests of cognitive and mental development." In effect, parents' responsiveness to young kids matters a lot for cognitive growth (hardly a new finding), but even good day care as we practice it today, while it helps, does not have a big effect. John Bruer, accordingly, hints at the questions of policy these findings suggest. For example: Should we "invest in fewer but higher-quality day care slots" to help improve current practice, "or in more but less expensive slots" to achieve better coverage? That's certainly a reasonable and research-worthy policy question.

So why all the fuss? Bruer puts it wryly: people have come to think that "it is better to have synapses than even God on your side." And the evidence from "damaged brains" seems to them more compelling than the evidence from "damaged lives or insecure attachments." Scary talk about developing brains has deadly effects, even if it does no more than create those back-of-the-mind suspicions that "maybe there's something to it." Such claims can provoke the

school board of Montgomery County, Maryland, to make their kindergarten program more "academic"—"Academics Instead of Naps," as The Washington Post headlined the story. But does it make sense to begin reading and writing at three?

[Part] 9

Again, Hungary's preschools are instructive: they emphasize that there should be much more oral work as a prelude to reading (including nursery rhymes, songs, and show-and-tells). And it works. So does it work in Flemish Belgium. And in German-speaking Switzerland, kids who start reading later and are given lots of oral training are more literate by age twelve than their French-Swiss cousins, who begin reading at four. The "new" Britain, probably the most hurry-up-and-read country in Europe, drops steadily lower in the literacy league tables.7 Small wonder John Bruer is indignant. And his clearly written book serves his cautionary purposes well.

How did we get into the present early-or-never pedagogical overkill? I suspect there are two quite different things at work—one very mundane, the other almost as mythological as Anna Freud's three-year-old committing all the crimes in the statute book.

First, the mundane. Many more young mothers are joining the labor force, and it is neither easy nor inexpensive for them to find good child care for their kids. They worry whether they're doing the right thing, and the current patchwork quilt of child care facilities is not reassuring. By comparison, France looks after 85 percent of its three-year-olds in nationally financed and thriving écoles maternelles. Add to the American malaise the widespread but false belief among parents that all children will have to master highbrow mathematics and science to get on in the technological age ahead.8 Relevant as well is what Barbara Ehrenreich has called the new middle-class "fear of falling"9 : move to the suburbs, invest your all in a big mortgage on the house, with nothing to leave one's children save the education you've given them, and it's not good enough.

The "mythological" side is no less telling, however bizarre it may be. It's a product of that human gullibility for dogmas of dread and danger about the young—Original Sin, the little criminal en route from Central Square, the 1920s theories claiming that showing affection to your kids would spoil them rotten. It doesn't even take an official theory to get parents to accept the bizarre hypothesis that their four-month-old is trying to "manipulate" them. Bad-news theories seem to comfort us by providing a dire scenario that makes our own situation seem tame.

A look at the century just gone by gives some sense of the way we mythologize early childhood. It swings between dread and celebration. The very word "kindergarten" implies that kids need to be sheltered and nurtured like delicate blossoms. There were deviants from this tender view—like Maria Montessori, who envisaged preschool as a special and protected place where Rome's slum kids could be taught the skills and habits needed for escaping poverty. But in the interwar years in America, kindergarten and preschool were still very much in the tender tradition, very self-consciously "child-centered." We middle-class Americans seemed pleased with ourselves, with our kids, with our nursery schools, and most important of all, with the future.

[Footnote]——7 See Clare and David Mills, "Britain's early years disaster," a background research memorandum prepared for a documentary on BBC4, "Too Much, Too Young" by the producer, David Mills of Mills Production Ltd., 45 Loftus Road, London W12

[Footnote]—— 8 Anthony P. Carnevale and Donna M. Desrochers, *School Satisfaction: A Statistical Survey of Cities and Suburbs* (Educational Testing Service, 1999).

[Footnote]——9 *Fear of Falling: The Inner Life of the Middle* (Pantheon, 1989).

[Part] 10

Then came World War II. By its end, several things had happened. For one, research in the

behavioral sciences changed direction, as it were, from positive to negative, to an emphasis not so much on what makes the mind grow as on what stunts its growth. The concept of "deprivation" became central. First came "sensory deprivation."10 If you keep an adult in a featureless fog for twenty-four hours, a Ganzfeld as it was called, he emerges dimmer cognitively, unable to concentrate, easily confused. After a few hours back in the "real" world, he recovers. The press likened this process to "brainwashing," but many behavioral scientists speculated, quite rightly as it turned out, that perhaps a certain minimum level of sensory hubbub must also be needed for normal brain (and mental) development to occur. To test this hunch, several teams of investigators raised laboratory rats from birth to young adulthood in dull, impoverished environments and discovered that they ended up much stupider than their litter-mate controls raised in normal environments. And they did not recover spontaneously once put back into the "real" world. Besides, there were indications (never fully verified) that such sensory deprivation produced defects in neurotransmission.

That was the start. "Deprivation" became the ruling metaphor for what might deter or hinder growth. A second wave of deprivation studies then followed, inspired by the English psychoanalyst John Bowlby, who reported that virtually all the adult psychopaths he had studied had been "deprived" of early "attachment" to their real or foster parents. This rather sober-sided study was soon followed by the famous Wisconsin study of young macaques raised by terry-cloth artificial "mothers." The monkeys grew up fearful, out of control, completely deranged. "Attachment deprivation" was added to the list of publicly proclaimed childhood horrors.

The forms of "deprivation" the mice and macaques experienced required extreme, highly aberrant conditions of early rearing, conditions difficult and expensive to maintain even for animals. When Head Start was first proposed as a way of countering the poor school performance of kids from poverty backgrounds, however, it, too, was justified on the ground that these kids also were suffering "deprivation"—not sensory deprivation, not attachment deprivation, but "cultural" deprivation. America had just "discovered" poverty.11 Poverty "causes" cultural deprivation. Head Start would replace what was missing by starting children early, before school began.

Then, out of the blue, a new line of research exploded on the scene, this time demonstrating the unexpectedly precocious "mental" capacities of young infants. William James's bon mot about the infant's world being a "blooming, buzzing confusion" turned out to be humbug. The scientific journals were flooded with new findings—soon picked up by the popular press. For example, even before six months, a baby will suck on a dummy nipple to bring a motherly face into better focus, but will desist when sucking sends the face into blur. Or, to take another example, older infants, given a choice, will choose a visual display that is richer in information than will younger ones.12 During their first year, the research soon showed, children were cognitively active, well on their way to being "scientists in the crib."

[foot note]——10 See Donald Hebb's *The Organization of Behavior* (Wiley, 1949), which set forth the view, following the great Spanish neurologist Lorente de No that the very organization of the brain depended upon early and continuing patterns of stimulation that created "cell assemblies" (what we now refer to as "neural networks").
[foot note]——11 See Michael Harrington, *The Other America* (Penguin, 1971). (back)
[foot note]——12 This finding conforms, course, to the conclusion *The Scientist in the Crib* that the more knowledge the child achieves, the better able she is to process new, richer information encountered.

First the devastating effects of early deprivation, then the unsuspected precocity of the infant mind. How could the two be put together? What emerged in popular thinking was a bizarre and forbidding conclusion: if the infant is that mentally alert very early on, then early deprivation must be all the more damaging. It is a bizarre conclusion for two obvious but easily overlooked reasons. For one thing, the "deprivation" of those early studies was extreme deprivation—grayed-out environments and terry-cloth mothers that don't occur in "real life." And for another, there is nothing to suggest that early cognitive abilities make kids more liable to harm or that they require that children be raised in an academically more "stimulating"

environment. If anything, early precocity argues in favor of more opportunity for exploratory play for young children (as I and others have long argued13). And besides, does one want to expose very young children to the experiences of failure inherent in "academic tasks"?

Much of the worry about "deprivation" is misplaced; and so is the counterpart worry that we aren't "stimulating" children enough. Most kids have plenty of stimulation, and there is no credible evidence that higher-pressure, more "enriched" early environments produce "good" effects in the sense that drastically deprived ones produce bad effects. Certainly the European evidence I cited earlier should give us pause about "kid-pushing" in general. Perhaps Hungary has a lesson to teach us.

As for all the talk about the permanent effects of the unstimulated early brain, both our gullible reaction to it and our eagerness to use it in support of decent child care policy speak volumes about the New Reductionism that has America in its grip at the start of a new technological era, perhaps even a millennium. Clearly John Bruer is right to be concerned that unfounded brain-talk might drive us to "toughen up" our kindergartens, nursery schools, even our playfulness with kids. So how might we get such angst under control? Certainly, books like The Scientist in the Crib and The Myth of the First Three Years should have a calming effect.

But the prospects of restoring a humane perspective on the human condition do not seem bright in the short run. The new reductionism is being fed by too many sources—the oversimplified evolutionary turn of much contemporary psychology, the gung-ho "it's-all-in-the-brain" proclamations of a few neuroscientists, and the Wellsian fantasies of recombinant genetics, to name three of the most prominent. If we can map physical and even mental illness on the human genome, then why not the human mind, human culture, human whatever? But can we map the never-ending contingencies facing Ulysses as he repaired his boat to meet the unforeseen troubles that befell him? Or lay out how a nervous system (with as many neurons as stars in the Milky Way) will shape up in response to the opportunities that an ever-changing environment brings its way? Obviously we are learning more and more all the time, including the fact that the brain is not our unforgiving keeper.

And while we are indeed learning more and more about the natural world, we would do well not to forget the big lesson of the twentieth century: the better we get at controlling the world of nature, the more difficulty we seem to have in maintaining a humane social order.

[foot note]——13 Jerome Bruner, "The Importance of Play," in Roger Lewin, editor, Child Alive! (Doubleday, 1975).

Attachment 2

Child care linked to aggressive behavior Study finds toddlers' time in facilities boosts likelihood of defiance

Detroit News; Detroit, Mich.; Apr 19, 2001; Shankar Vedantam;
Sub Title: [One Dot Edition]
Start Page: 03
Dateline: MINNEAPOLIS

Abstract:
The government-sponsored research, which has tracked more than 1,300 children at 10 sites across the country since 1991, is bound to rekindle the debate over child care, a debate that resonates across every income group and every demographic: How should people balance work and family? And how should parents, especially mothers, resolve the demands that are placed on them to be breadwinners and Supermoms?

Children who spend over 30 hours a week in child care "scored higher on items like 'gets in lots of fights,' 'cruelty,' 'explosive behavior,' as well as 'talking too much,' 'argues a lot,' and 'demands a lot of attention,' " said Jay Belsky of Birkbeck College in London, one of the lead investigators of the study. "If more time in all sorts of (child care) arrangements is predicting disconcerting outcomes, then if you want to reduce the probability of those outcomes, you reduce the time in care. Extend parental leave and part time work."

Full Text:

MINNEAPOLIS -- The more hours that toddlers spend in child care, the more likely they are to turn out aggressive, disobedient and defiant by the time they are in kindergarten, according to the largest and most authoritative study of child care and development ever conducted.

Researchers Wednesday said this correlation held true regardless of whether the children came from rich or poor homes, were looked after by a relative, a nanny or at a center, and whether they were girls or boys.

What is uncertain, however, is whether the child care actually causes the problem or whether children likely to turn out aggressive happen to be those who spend more hours in child care. It also remains unclear whether reducing child care will reduce the risk that a child will turn into a mean-spirited bully.

Complicating matters further, quality child care is associated with increased skills in intellectual ability like language and memory, leading some academics to suggest that child care turns out children who are "smart and nasty."

The government-sponsored research, which has tracked more than 1,300 children at 10 sites across the country since 1991, is bound to rekindle the debate over child care, a debate that resonates across every income group and every demographic: How should people balance work and family? And how should parents, especially mothers, resolve the demands that are placed on them to be breadwinners and Supermoms?

That debate was already on display Wednesday, when researchers themselves clashed about the data and its implications.

Children who spend over 30 hours a week in child care "scored higher on items like 'gets in lots of fights,' 'cruelty,' 'explosive behavior,' as well as 'talking too much,' 'argues a lot,' and 'demands a lot of attention,' " said Jay Belsky of Birkbeck College in London, one of the lead investigators of the study. "If more time in all sorts of (child care) arrangements is predicting disconcerting outcomes, then if you want to reduce the probability of those outcomes, you reduce the time in care. Extend parental leave and part time work."

"There are other possibilities that can be entertained," responded Sarah Friedman, a developmental psychologist at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and one of the other lead scientists on the study.

The results will be presented today at a meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development in Minneapolis.

The researchers found that 17 percent of children who spent over 30 hours a week in child care demonstrated problem behaviors by the time they were between the ages of 4 1/2 and 6. Only 6 percent of those who spent less than 10 hours a week in such care had the same problems. The average time that children spent in child care between the ages of 3 months and 4 1/2 years was 26 hours a week.

The researchers said they had no idea whether the behavioral difficulties persisted as the children moved to higher grades. They also cautioned about extrapolating too much from the study -- for example, the data did not explain a recent spate of school violence.

"I'm not saying they are the super, hyper violent types," Belsky said. "These kids are more likely to be bullying kids. ... we are not talking of psychopaths and kids who gets guns and blow away other kids."

Credit: Washington Post

Record: 1
Title: . . . Quality Family Life.
Subject(s): BELSKY, Jay; CHILD care
Source: Brown University Child & Adolescent Behavior Letter, Nov99, Vol. 15 Issue 11, p2, 1/3p
Abstract: Discusses the findings of human development and child study expert Jay Belsky on the impact of child care on quality family life.
AN: 2544927
ISSN: 1058-1073
Database: MasterFILE Premier

Section: Keep Your Eye On

. . . QUALITY FAMILY LIFE.

The kind of family a child comes from is much more important to the child's development than whether or not the child is in some type of nonmaternal child care, according to an expert in human development and family study. Jay Belsky, Ph.D., distinguished professor of human development at Pennsylvania State University in University Park is collaborating with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) to study early child care. The study is a large investigation of more than 1,000 children and their families.

Belsky reports that the NICHD research indicates that characteristics of family life appear to exert a stronger and more consistent influence on all aspects of child functioning during the first three years of life than child care does.

"Strong economic resources and parent education provide children with developmental advantages," says Belsky. "Other factors in families that may exert good influences are mothers who are psychologically healthy . . . and parents who are more sensitive, responsive and emotionally available to their children. Their children function much better socially, emotionally and cognitively through the first three years than those who grow up in less economically and psychologically healthy families." (American Medical Association.) For more information, contact Amy Fox, AMA, 515 North State St., Chicago, IL 60610. Telephone: (312) 464-4843. Or, e-mail Jay Belsky at j.belsky@psychology.bbk.ac.uk.

Source: Brown University Child & Adolescent Behavior Letter, Nov99, Vol. 15 Issue 11, p2, 1/3p.
Item Number: 2544927

Attachment 3

Bullying affects nearly one in three kids
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel; Milwaukee, Wis.; Apr 25, 2001; LINDSEY TANNER;

Sub Title:
[Final Edition]
Start Page:
03A
Personal Names:
Nansel, Tonja
Abstract:
Chicago -- Amid growing concern over school violence, a nationwide study has found that bullying involves nearly one of every three U.S. children in sixth through 10th grades. Young students and boys were most likely to be involved.

The authors say their survey of 15,686 public and private school students is among the first to document the U.S. prevalence of bullying, and the results show that not enough has been done to prevent what is often seen as an unpleasant rite of passage.

Since nationwide research on bullying is so scarce, the survey doesn't show whether the U.S. prevalence is rising, she said. And while it did not examine criminal behavior, the survey found that fighting was more common among both bullied and bullying children.

Full Text:

Bullying affects nearly one in three kids, study finds

Programs in schools could prevent trouble later on, researchers say

By LINDSEY TANNER

Associated Press

Wednesday, April 25, 2001

Chicago -- Amid growing concern over school violence, a nationwide study has found that bullying involves nearly one of every three U.S. children in sixth through 10th grades. Young students and boys were most likely to be involved.

The authors say their survey of 15,686 public and private school students is among the first to document the U.S. prevalence of bullying, and the results show that not enough has been done to prevent what is often seen as an unpleasant rite of passage.

"It's a problem that has been in a lot of ways ignored for quite a while," said researcher Tonja Nansel of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the study's lead author.

The 1998 survey, part of the U.S. contribution to a study of worldwide childhood health and behavior by the World Health Organization, appears in today's Journal of the American Medical Association.

Bullying has been implicated in recent school shootings, including the March slayings of two students in Santee, Calif., and the 1999 massacre of 13 by two suicidal students at Colorado's Columbine High School.

A growing number of schools across the country have adopted bullying intervention programs; the Colorado Legislature is considering a proposal that would require school districts to develop an anti-bullying policy.

Nansel said such programs had been shown to work in other countries but are untested in the United States, where efforts to address the problem have been hampered by a pervasive attitude "that kids will be kids and this is just going to happen."

Since nationwide research on bullying is so scarce, the survey doesn't show whether the U.S. prevalence is rising, she said. And while it did not examine criminal behavior, the survey found that fighting was more common among both bullied and bullying children.

Overall, 30% of students in the survey reported occasional or frequent involvement as a victim and/or perpetrator in bullying -- defined as verbal or physical behavior designed to disturb someone less powerful.

More than 16% said they had been bullied at least occasionally during the current school term and 8% reported bullying or being bullied at least once weekly.

Looks or speech were far more frequent targets of bullying than race or religion, the survey found.

Children who said they were bullied reported more loneliness and difficulty making friends, while those who did the bullying were more likely to have poor grades and to smoke and drink alcohol, the survey found.

Other research has shown that people who were bullied as children are prone to depression and low self-esteem as adults, and that bullies are more likely to engage in criminal behavior.

Nansel said the pervasiveness of bullying doesn't mean it should be accepted as inevitable, noting that studies in England and Norway have shown that school-based intervention programs can reduce it by 30% to 50%.

Kevin Dwyer, a school psychologist and adviser for the National Mental Health Association, said there is evidence that the incidence of physical fights and violence in schools has actually declined in recent years.

To reduce bullying, schools need to involve all staff members, parents and even student bystanders, whose silence may suggest tacit approval.

JAMA: http://jama.ama-assn.org

NICHD: www.nichd.nih.gov

Credit: Associated Press

Area schools try to curb bullying
Milwaukee Journal Sentinel; Milwaukee, Wis.; Jun 1, 2001; CORISSA JANSEN;

Sub Title: [Metro Edition]
Start Page:
01B
Personal Names:
Steber, Jan
Babcock, Linda
Green, Joel

Abstract:
A new anti-bullying strategy is also under way in Germantown, where 500 high school students this week signed "no taunting" pledges inspired by students who took similar action in 1999, after Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris opened fire at Columbine High School near Littleton, Colo.

Bullying and confrontations between students in Palmyra-Eagle schools have been on the decline since the start of a variety of programs emphasizing acceptance over tolerance, said high school Principal Joel Green.

Wauwatosa elementary schools also spread anti-bullying and conflict-resolution messages through tools such as the "Peace Patrol" at Lincoln Elementary School, where fourth- and fifth-graders scour the halls and the playground, looking to help kids who are being bullied or left out.

Full Text:

Area schools try to curb bullying
`No taunting' vows, workshops employed to stress tolerance

By CORISSA JANSEN
of the Journal Sentinel staff
Friday, June 1, 2001

It was an unusual mix at a two-day "communications retreat" this year for 50 Oconomowoc High School students who represented social cliques ranging from cheerleaders to Goth kids.

"The purpose of that is to break down barriers," the school's prevention and wellness coordinator Jan Steber said of the retreat.

"At the end of the two days, they see people for who they are, not what they wear."

During a year in which U.S. Education Secretary Rod Paige warns that students' "alienation and rage" are the biggest factors in school shootings, the Oconomowoc program is one of many in area school districts carrying messages of tolerance and respect for others.

Name-calling and bullying have always been present in school life. But a series of school shootings across the country since 1997 -- many triggered by harassment and taunting -- have made people more aware of their emotional toll and possible consequences.

Like Oconomowoc, several area school districts have launched anti- bullying programs in hopes their districts won't make the headlines.

"You don't want to be caught in a situation where it's too late and you could have stopped something before it escalates into violence," said Linda Babcock, social worker at Wauwatosa West High School and Whitman Middle School.

About five years ago, Babcock said, a group of teachers and administrators took stock of students' behavior in Wauwatosa and didn't like what they saw.

"We decided to sort of take back our schools before it got out of control and led to something serious," Babcock said.

To that end, Wauwatosa sixth-graders go through a three-day workshop on harassment that covers everything from tripping one another in the hallways to slamming each other's locker doors. That's followed up with another workshop in eighth grade.

The idea is to lay a foundation of respect in middle school that will carry over into high school, Babcock said.

A new anti-bullying strategy is also under way in Germantown, where 500 high school students this week signed "no taunting" pledges inspired by students who took similar action in 1999, after Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris opened fire at Columbine High School near Littleton, Colo.

In the deadliest U.S. school shooting to date, 12 students and a teacher were killed at Columbine. Klebold and Harris killed themselves after the rampage.

Strategies to reduce violence will be one of the headlining topics at an October workshop of the Wisconsin School Safety Coordinators Association, a group representing about 300 school districts.

"School violence reduction is always on the agenda," said Erin Gauthier, president of the association and safety manager for the Palmyra-Eagle School District.

Accepting others

Bullying and confrontations between students in Palmyra-Eagle schools have been on the decline since the start of a variety of programs emphasizing acceptance over tolerance, said high school Principal Joel Green.

"Tolerance indicates there's something you don't like and you're putting up with it," Green said. "We wanted to make a program where people work together simply because it's the right thing to do."

As in Germantown, students in the Palmyra-Eagle district serving areas of Jefferson and Waukesha counties are encouraged to sign a variety of pledges at the beginning of the school year. They range from an agreement to be smoke-free to a pledge not to bully one another.

"It's a series of seemingly minor things but, boy, you put them them together and it's a phenomenal force," Green said. "The vast majority seem to take it to heart, whether they sign the pledge or not."

Green also attributes a low level of student conflicts in the district to a mentoring program that pairs incoming ninth-graders with older high school students who can help them adjust to what can be a confusing and frustrating new environment.

"Most of the time when students lash out at somebody else, it's because they're angry, frustrated or jealous," Green said. "When you can channel that anger or frustration into something productive, everybody wins and you can avoid what might have otherwise been a tragic consequence."

Oconomowoc's Steber said that in addition to heading off violence and fostering tolerance, her district's communications retreats also provide a venue for new friendships to bloom.

"It's just a fantastic experience, for both the faculty and the kids," Steber said of the retreats, which a principal brought with him from a Detroit-area school district in 1993. "Since we started this, there really are very few confrontations here."

Students keeping order

Wauwatosa elementary schools also spread anti-bullying and conflict-resolution messages through tools such as the "Peace Patrol" at Lincoln Elementary School, where fourth- and fifth-graders scour the halls and the playground, looking to help kids who are being bullied or left out.

A "Peace Bridge" at Eisenhower Elementary School walks students through the steps of resolving a conflict, with both sides meeting in the middle to shake hands and reach a conclusion.

Babcock said schools are increasingly trying to teach students appropriate behavior at early ages partly because that level of decorum simply isn't taught anymore in many homes.

"Bullying, name-calling -- it happened all the time when I was little," said Babcock, 54. "But back in the day, I think kids took it home to our families and our families dealt with it, even sitting down with another family to talk about it.

"Society's changing. What is expected of our young people is somewhat confusing to them, and I don't think parents are educating
them to the point that they used to."

Credit: Journal Sentinel staff

Attachment 4

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
BRIGHT BEGINNINGS & FAMILY-COMMUNITY-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP

Early Childhood: Unacceptable Trends in Kindergarten Entry and Placement

Overview of Position Statement
By the
National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education

Over the past several years members of NAECS/SDE have become increasingly alarmed at emerging attitudes and practices which erode children's legal rights to enter public school and participate in a beneficial educational program. Dramatic changes in what children are expected to do in kindergarten are resulting in wellintentioned interventions which are often inequitable, ineffective, and wasteful of limited public resources.

Many classroom teachers report that they have little or no part in decisions which determine curriculum and instructional methodology. Instead, those decisions are made by administrators, influenced by public demand for more stringent educational standards and the ready availability of commercial, standardized tests.

Additional pressure on kindergarten programs sometimes comes from primary teachers, who themselves face requirements for more effective instruction and higher pupil achievement. They argue that the kindergarten program should do more. In addition, a growing number of states and localities are raising the age of kindergarten eligibility, providing further evidence of changed expectations for kindergarten education and kindergarten children.

A number of highly questionable practices have resulted from the trend to demand more of kindergarten children. These practices include: 1) inappropriate uses of screening and readiness tests; 2) denial or discouragement of entrance for eligible children; 3) the development of segregated transitional classes for children deemed unready for the next traditional level of school; and 4) an increasing use of retention.

Two predominant considerations underlie these practices. The first is a drive to achieve homogeneity in instructional groupings. Some educators believe that instruction will be easier and more effective if the variability within the class is reduced. There is, however, no compelling evidence that children learn more or better in homogeneous groupings. In fact, most of them learn more efficiently and achieve more satisfactory social/emotional development in mixedability groups.

The second is a wellintentioned effort to protect children from inappropriately high demands on their intellectual and affective abilities. When parents are counseled to delay a child's entry or when children are placed in "developmental" or "readiness" classes to prepare for kindergarten or "transitional" classes to prepare for first grade, it is often because the school program is perceived to be too difficult for those children. In this view, children must be made ready for the program, in contrast to tailoring the program to the strengths and needs of the children.

Delaying children's entry into school and/or segregating them into extrayear classes actually label children as failures at the outset of their school experience. These practices are simply subtle forms of retention. Not only is there a preponderance of evidence that there is no academic benefit from retention in its many forms, but there also appear to be threats to the socialemotional development of the child subjected to such practices. The educational community can no longer afford to ignore the consequences of policies and practices which: 1) assign the burden of responsibility to the child, rather than the program; 2) place the child at risk of failure, apathy toward school, and demoralization; and 3) fail to contribute to quality early childhood education.

Resources on Unacceptable Trends

Bredekamp, S. and Shepard, L. "How best to protect children from inappropriate school expectations, practices, and policies," Young Children, 44(3), 1989.

A packet of information on unacceptable trends is available by contacting Steve Kretzmann (608) 267-9278

Questions about this page should be directed to Steve Kretzmann (608) 267-9278

[Return to Wisconsin's Early Childhood Home Page]

DEPARTMENT HOMEPAGE | SEARCH THIS SITE | BBFCSP HOMEPAGE

Attachment 5

The New York Times

Adding Some Sleep to Children's Agendas

New York Times ; New York, N.Y.; Sep 4, 2001; Eric Nagourney;

Edition: Late Edition (East Coast)
Column Name: Vital Signs: Stages
Start Page: F.8
ISSN: 03624331
Subject Terms: Sleep deprivation
Children & youth

Abstract:
Teenagers need just as much sleep, but they are the least likely to get it, and lack of sleep can increase their risk of car accidents.

As part of the campaign, health officials plan to distribute to schools educational and promotional materials, including games and puzzles, that emphasize the importance of sleep.

Full Text:

Parents battling to get their children to bed on time can now argue (or plead) that the federal government is on their side.

With a new school year beginning, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute is starting a "star sleeper" campaign intended to encourage children to get more sleep.

Too many of them do not get enough rest, the institute says, and the result can lead to diverse problems, like difficulties with schoolwork and relationships with friends and family.

Chronic sleep deprivation may also set the stage for health problems that occur later in life.

The message health officials want to send to children age 7 to 11 -- as well as to their parents, teachers and doctors -- is that they should get at least nine hours of sleep a night.

Teenagers need just as much sleep, but they are the least likely to get it, and lack of sleep can increase their risk of car accidents.

As part of the campaign, health officials plan to distribute to schools educational and promotional materials, including games and puzzles, that emphasize the importance of sleep.

Sleep tight - It's essential for the body & the mind

Providence Journal ; Providence, R.I.; Jun 24, 2001;

Sub Title: [All Edition]
Start Page: M-01
Personal Names: **Gupta, Rakesh**
Owens, Judith A

Abstract:
Sleep also affects the endocrine system. "Growth hormone is secreted mainly during sleep," [Rakesh Gupta] says. For children, sleep deprivation could affect growth. In adults, growth hormone is needed to build tissue, Gupta says, so one could speculate on how sleep deprivation might affect one's ability to heal wounds or maintain muscle mass.

"We need to answer why we sleep and what effect sleep has on the metabolism of each cell," Gupta says. "What is it that has that restorative function? What chemicals and multiplicity of chemicals build up during wakefulness? ... Each stage of sleep may have a different function."

"It's not just a single night on call. It's the fact that it's cumulative," [Judith A. Owens] says. "A partial, chronic sleep loss can result in negative effects as powerful as going without sleep at all. Individuals restricted to six hours of sleep per night for five nights performed just as poorly on a series of tests as individuals who had no sleep the previous night.

Full Text:

RELATED STORIES ON PAGES M-01, M-06 AND M-07.

* * *

PROVIDENCE - Why sleep? Who's got the time?

For many people, sleep is what you do when everything else is done.

But those who study sleep or treat people with sleep disorders have long argued that sleep is so important to health that it belongs at the top of the list. And the evidence is growing that they're right.

You probably already know that if you don't get enough sleep, you'll feel drowsy and out of sorts, your thinking won't be as sharp, your attention span will shrink, and you might even fall asleep at the wheel.

But new research suggests that sleep deprivation affects not just the conscious brain but every cell in the body.

Blood pressure and heart rate go up when you miss out on sleep, says Dr. Rakesh Gupta, director of the Sleep Disorders Center at Roger Williams Medical Center, in Providence.

Additionally, there is evidence that the cells of sleep-deprived people are less sensitive to insulin, and thus less able to metabolize sugar. This could have implications for people with diabetes or a propensity for diabetes, Gupta says.

Sleep also affects the endocrine system. "Growth hormone is secreted mainly during sleep," Gupta says. For children, sleep deprivation could affect growth. In adults, growth hormone is needed to build tissue, Gupta says, so one could speculate on how sleep deprivation might affect one's ability to heal wounds or maintain muscle mass.

"I can go about taking each and every [body] system and point out something that has to do with sleep," Gupta says.

For example, some research suggests that lack of sleep can make you hungrier and inclined to overeat because without sleep you don't produce enough of the hormone that quiets appetite.

"It's also felt sleep is important in consolidating memories - helpful in the learning process, especially during childhood," Gupta says. Experiments have shown that people who don't sleep after a learning experience don't retain what they've learned.

Unfortunately, Gupta remarks, sleep research receives limited financing, so many questions remain unanswered.

"We need to answer why we sleep and what effect sleep has on the metabolism of each cell," Gupta says. "What is it that has that restorative function? What chemicals and multiplicity of chemicals build up during wakefulness? ... Each stage of sleep may have a different function."

But, he says, "We don't have that kind of data where we can say that people who habitually sleep less have lower life expectancy.

"It seems very logical that adequate sleep is good for health. Even though the long-term data are not there, there are enough data from shorter studies one week or a few days of sleep deprivation to make it very reasonable to say that it could be detrimental upon multiple body systems."

Even if the scientific evidence mounts, a bigger problem may be changing attitudes toward sleep. People don't perceive scrimping on sleep as self-destructive, Gupta says, but instead regard it as virtuous and diligent to stay up late to work.

Dr. Judith A. Owens, director of the sleep disorders clinic at Hasbro Children's Hospital who is also studying how medical residents cope with sleep deprivation has encountered extreme versions of such attitudes at hospitals, where residents are regarded as slothful if they don't ignore their need for sleep.

In New York, the only state that limits residents' hours, the rules are routinely broken, she says not just by hospitals but also by the residents themselves, whose superiors look askance if they leave the patient's bedside when their shift is supposed to end.

In one experiment, Owens notes, a group of residents on call were relieved from their duties from 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. It turned out that those who got this relief actually got less sleep than other residents because they used the time to catch up on other work.

It's an issue with personal roots for Owens, who remembers her own residency 20 years ago in which she was on call every third night as "one of the most brutal, depersonalizing experiences I ever had." Driving home from her last night on call as a resident, Owens had a serious accident that totaled her

car. Although it wasn't her fault, she believes she would have avoided the accident had she been alert.

"It's not just a single night on call. It's the fact that it's cumulative," Owens says. "A partial, chronic sleep loss can result in negative effects as powerful as going without sleep at all. Individuals restricted to six hours of sleep per night for five nights performed just as poorly on a series of tests as individuals who had no sleep the previous night.

"We need to reconfigure our priorities," Owens says. "There are hard choices. I will not minimize the hard choices." But on one's personal priority list, getting enough sleep needs "to be right up there with good nutrition and not smoking."

Or, as Gupta puts it: "Make time for sleep."

* * *

JOURNAL PHOTO ILLUSTRATION / SANDOR BODO

* * *

SLEEP TEACHER: People with insomnia often have some things in common, such as a tendency to internalize emotion and to exert control in their lives, says Donn Posner, a behavior and insomnia consultant for the Sleep Disorders Center, at Lifespan Hospitals.

JOURNAL PHOTO / WILLIAM K. DABY

Attachment 6

Headline: Parents speak: Home care is way better than day care

Byline: Marilyn Gardner, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Date: 08/23/2000

Just before the birth of her first child in April, Jennifer Arnold went to her boss with a bold wish list. She wanted to be able to pick and choose her own hours.

It was a radical idea, never tried in the conservative investment firm where Ms. Arnold, of Waukesha, Wisc., works as a marketing specialist. But she knew she wanted to minimize the hours the couple's infant son would spend in day care and maximize the time she and her husband could spend with him at home.

Arnold's request typifies the dreams of a growing number of parents of very young children. In a wide-ranging study of child care released yesterday, researchers uncovered at least two striking findings. The youngest generation of mothers strongly prefer staying at home with their kids. And parents of young children don't necessarily want more help with day care from government or employers. They see the responsibility as their own.

"Parents are saying in every way you can possibly hear that having a parent at home is better for kids," says Deborah Wadsworth, president of Public Agenda, the nonpartisan public policy organization that made the survey. "It's very important for us to listen to the desires of parents of young kids and to try to craft policies and solutions that mirror these values."

Seventy percent of parents and child advocates surveyed say that having one parent at home is the best child-care arrangement during the earliest years. Among mothers between the ages of 18 and 29, 80 percent prefer to be at home. They also express a deep distrust of day-care centers, viewing them as the option of last resort.

Some family advocates see the findings as evidence of a quiet shift in attitudes among young couples. "Young people have gotten the message about the importance of the first three years," says Ruth Wooden, president of the National Parenting Association in New York.

She also credits the maturing of the women's movement and changes on the part of young fathers, who are taking a "much more participatory interest" in their families than previous generations of fathers.

The study, which also surveyed employers and child advocates, refutes widely held notions that parents of very young children are clamoring for more help from government or employers. Ms. Wadsworth finds an "extraordinary number of parents of young children who believe absolutely first and foremost that the responsibility for raising young children is theirs. It's not the government's, it's not the employer's, it's theirs."

As one measure that parents are acting on their beliefs, 47 percent of those surveyed report that one parent in their family stays at home to care for their children in a typical week. At the same time, they refuse to criticize parents who use day care. They see child care as an important and necessary alternative that should be improved, not abandoned.

Marcy Whitebook, a long-time child-care advocate in Berkeley, Calif., sees two hurdles to progress. Many women, she finds, either cannot afford to quit or do not have jobs that permit them to work part time or leave for a while.

"The good news is that young women are really thinking about what they want for their children," Ms. Whitebook says. "But the bad news is that because we don't have a good child-care system, and because we leave people to fend for themselves about these issues, women aren't asking for help that they really deserve - and that could make their lives and their children's lives better."

While large numbers of working parents say they would use a high-quality on-site child-care center if their employer provided it, it remains a lower workplace priority than healthcare and retirement benefits. Similarly, on the political front, large numbers give higher priority to improving public schools and providing health insurance than to child care.

Sixty percent of parents in the study favor increasing government funding for programs like Head Start. They also recognize the need to tighten the licensing and regulation of child care.

As one encouraging sign, Susan Seitel, president of Work & Family Connection in Minnetonka, Minn., notes that more and more centers, particularly those supported by employers, are accredited. "We have studies showing that quality day care is very good for a child," she says.

At the same time, Ms. Seitel observes a dichotomy between what parents want and what employers need. The demand for employees is so critical, she says, that employers are trying to convince women that they should not quit. Companies are also offering more perks to keep workers.

Yet a willingness to accommodate parents of young kids, she emphasizes, can pay big dividends later. "These women who want to go home now may very well want to come back to the workforce in five years. The company that makes that easy for them will gain, because they will have the experienced workforce they need."

Arnold agrees. Her solution involves flexibility and part time day care. Despite initial skepticism, her employers agreed to let her work in the office from 8:30 to 3:30 Monday through Thursday. They also installed two telephone lines in her house so she can work two more hours at home each day. On Fridays, she telecommutes. "It's so much more productive," she says.

Other solutions center around tax credits. Two-thirds of parents favor giving a much bigger tax break to parents who stay home to care for their children.

"As a society," says Seitel, " we must respect the fact that raising children is the most important thing we have to do."

Testimony on Senate Bill 255
October 8, 2001

Thank you, Chairperson Grobschmidt and members of the Education Committee, for the opportunity to testify. I am Jane Grinde, Director of the Bright Beginnings/Family-School-Community Partnerships Team at the DPI.

When children receive quality early childhood education and care, everyone benefits: children, families, and communities.

As you know, Wisconsin school districts must offer kindergarten for 5-year-old children. Most districts offer full-day programs and many districts offer the option of both. In the last few years, more districts have begun to offer kindergarten programs to 4-year-olds. Currently over 1/3 of Wisconsin school districts offer 4- year old kindergarten to all children in their district and another 1/3 of the districts are looking into 4K.

Wisconsin has a rich history when it comes to early childhood education. Four-year-old children have been attending public schools here for over 100 years. Wisconsin made a commitment to early education in 1848 when the State Constitution, Article X, called for school districts to be as uniform as practical and free to all children between the ages of 4 and 20 years. Essentially all 4-year-old children in the community attended the one-room schools of the 19th century. Four-year-old kindergarten attendance peaked in the 1920s and then declined as schools shifted their emphasis to 5-year-olds. Eventually, kindergarten became a half-day program for 5-year-olds with some exceptions. A few districts in the Milwaukee area have maintained 4-year-old kindergarten for nearly a century, despite the fact that state funding was suspended between 1957 and 1984. During this time, there were compensatory programs for educationally disadvantaged and disabled 4-year-olds (such as Head Start, Title I, and special education) in many communities. In the 1980s, the state legislature renewed state aid for 4-year-old kindergarten and expanded state aid for full-day 5-year-old kindergarten.

Among the reasons for the resurgence in the popularity of 4-year-old kindergarten are:

- Educators and parents are interested in applying early brain development research, and exploring the role schools play in that area.
- As the legislature establishes an education "marketplace' and demands accountability, schools seek ways to improve student performance, 4-year-old kindergarten is one promising way to improve student achievement.
- Awareness is increasing around topics such as readiness, equity, and cost benefits of early learning opportunities.
- Increase in the state share of funding makes it more feasible for districts to fund it.
- Declining enrollment in some districts has made more space available.
- The number of two-wage earner families has increased dramatically, and parents are seeking increased quality care for their 4-year-old children.
- Parents are looking to their schools to provide early education opportunities for their 4-year-old children.

- Schools are trying to ensure opportunities for disadvantaged students so that they come to 5-year-old kindergarten ready to learn.

Along with this growing interest, we are pleased that schools are working with the child-care community to come up with innovative approaches to serving all children. DPI promotes a community-wide approach to 4-year-old kindergarten, and we are seeing school districts beginning to partner with child care and Head Start in their community. This helps make a more seamless program for those 4-year-old children who need full-day care, and it helps build quality child care settings by brining in additional resources and degreed teachers. La Crosse is good example.

As you know State Superintendent Burmaster has made closing the achievement gap between children of poverty and their peers a top priority. Clearly, offering quality 4-year-old kindergarten for all children is a key element in closing the achievement gap.

In a report from the U.S. Department of Education, entitled "Start Early, Finish Strong, How to Help Every Child Become a Reader," the message is clear: High quality early childhood programs can help prevent reading difficulties.

Similarly in Wisconsin, the Governor and the state departments of Workforce Development and Health and Family Services recognize the importance of starting early. The DPI is a partner with them and others for the statewide campaign to "Think Big. Start Small." This campaign is based on these facts:

- Learning begins at birth.
- Over 70 percent of young children spend time in early education and care outside their homes.
- Caregivers trained in early education are critical to building young minds.
- The opportunities we provide to all children shape who they will become tomorrow.

We ask for your support of this progressive legislation that will pay dividends in the long run. Our children deserve the best. Thank you.

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Testimony of Audra Millen
Legislative Policy Specialist, Milwaukee Public Schools

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Testimony in support of SB255

October 9, 2001
Madison, WI

Thank you Chairman Grobschmidt and Committee members.

I am honored to address this committee and to testify in strong support of SB255. Funding for all day four-year old kindergarten should be one of the greatest priorities for our State. Instead it is one of the most misunderstood issues; as a result our youngest and most vulnerable children have been the victims of politics and misinformation. I would like to take this opportunity to provide some facts about the benefits of all-day four-year old kindergarten programs.

Funding all-day K-4 is a good investment. Research demonstrates that early childhood education provides long-term benefits to children at high risk of failing in school. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Projects Study, which tracked children who participated in high quality, early childhood programming, found the following:

- 71% of participants graduated from high school compared to only 54% for non-participants.
- 36% of participants are homeowners compared to only 13% for non-participants.
- 29% of participants make more than $2,000 per month compared to only 7% for non-participants.

In tough financial times, the State should place a priority on investing in programs that promise such impressive returns.

K4 programs are the best option for many Wisconsin students. Some legislators argue that offering K4 programs is bad policy because care for four-year-olds should be the responsibility of the family. Unfortunately, this is not an option for many families. Due to economic realities, many Milwaukee parents find it necessary to work and cannot afford to stay home with their children. Without the option of all-day K-4, these families would have to find childcare for a whole or half day. MPS is partnering with our childcare community to improve the childcare opportunities, but we believe that four-year olds are best served by the opportunities we offer in our research-based K-4 programs.

Funding all-day K-4 will save TANF funds. If all-day K-4 is not offered, many of these children would opt for child care either for the second half of the day or for a full-day in a private provider. A full-day with a licensed provider can cost as much as $5904 per child for the school year. Providing the additional .4 under this proposal would cost only $2268.

Parents want all day K4. In Milwaukee, a recent survey conducted in concert with the Neighborhood Schools Initiative found that 75% of parents said they would send their child

to an all day K4 kindergarten program if it were offered. In response to this finding, MPS expanded its full-day K-4 offerings for the upcoming school year. As a result, our total four-year old enrollment is expected to increase significantly, even in the face of declining birthrates statewide.

Unfortunately, despite all of these benefits, districts are still required to subsidize all-day K-4 programs because the State has not fully-funded these initiatives. This is an opportunity for the state to make a wise investment in our children's future.

Moen, Lisa

From: Small, Delores
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2001 9:08 AM
To: Burke, Peter; Yates, Tricia; Moen, Lisa
Subject: Re: Sen. Education Committee hearing 10-9-01

Lisa,
I just spoke with Jeffrey Barnett's assistant and she caught a minor error in the notice of the hearing: the expiration date of his term is July 1, 2004, as he was appointed to a three-year term in July of this year. (He had been completing a term for someone who had resigned due to a job change).

Delores

>>> Moen, Lisa 10/1/01 11:38:32 AM >>>

Senate

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Committee on Education

The committee will hold a public hearing on the following items at the time specified below:

Tuesday, October 9, 2001
9:00 a.m.
300 Southeast
State Capitol

JEFFREY BARNETT
Of Whitewater, as a member of the Professional Standards Council for Teachers, to serve for the term ending July 1, 2001.

DIANE OPPERMAN
Of Iola, as a member of the Professional Standards Council for Teachers, to serve for the term ending July 1, 2002.

MARLENE OTT
Of Greendale, as a member of the Professional Standards Council for Teachers, to serve for the term ending July 1, 2002.

KAREN VIECHNICKI
Of River Falls, as a member of the Professional Standards Council for Teachers, to serve for the term ending July 1, 2002.

BARRY, JONATHAN B., of Mount Horeb, as a member of the Wisconsin Technical College System Board, to serve for the interim term ending May 1, 2003.

REID, L. ANNE, of West Bend, as a member of the Wisconsin Technical College System Board, to serve for the term ending May 1, 2007.

FRANCO, GEORGE, of Milwaukee, as a member of the Wisconsin Technical College System Board, to serve for the interim term ending May 1, 1999 and for the full term ending May 1, 2005.

Senate Bill 224
Relating to: determination of annual salaries for the director and the executive assistant of the Wisconsin Technical College System.
By the Joint committee on Employment Relations.

Senate Bill 72
Relating to: authorizing the state superintendent of public instruction to award grants for family involvement in education projects and making appropriations.
By Senator Grobschmidt and Burke; cosponsored by Representatives Sinicki, Bock, Pettis, Gronemus, Lassa, Plale, Turner, Ryba, Richards, Seratti, Gunderson, Miller and Shilling.

Senate Bill 243
Relating to: increasing a school district's revenue limit for the costs of teaching school professional staff how to use digital technology and distance-learning technology.
By Senator Erpenbach and Grobschmidt.

Senate Bill 244
Relating to: school district use of educational technology block grants.
By Senator Erpenbach.

Senate Bill 254
Relating to: counting summer school enrollment for revenue limit purposes.
By Senators Grobschmidt, Plache, Burke and Moen; cosponsored by Representatives J. Lehman, Plale, Turner, Cullen, Miller, Krug, Staskunas, La Fave, Young, Bock, Pocan, Black and Ryba.

Senate Bill 255
Relating to: modifying the manner in which a pupil enrolled in a 4-year-old kindergarten program is counted for state aid.
By Senators Grobschmidt, Moore, George, Burke, Plache, Shibilski and Moen; cosponsored by Representatives Riley, Richards, Gronemus, Turner, Sinicki, Musser, Cullen, Miller, La Fave, Krug, Black, Pocan and Young.

The Committee will also receive a brief report from the Professional Standards Council.

An EXECUTIVE SESSION may be held on any of the above or any other matters pending before the committee.

Senator Richard Grobschmidt
Chair